



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,047	03/04/2002	Hugh H. Shieh	6541-62417	6514
24197	7590	02/15/2006	EXAMINER	
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP 121 SW SALMON STREET SUITE 1600 PORTLAND, OR 97204			GEE, JASON KAI YIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/091,047

Applicant(s)

SHIEH, HUGH H.

Examiner

Jason K. Gee

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03/04/2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/24/03, 4/22/03, 02/25/04 JKG
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This action is response to communication: filed on 03/04/2002 with acknowledgement of benefit date of 04/17/2001.
2. Claims 1-28 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 11, 14, 17, and 23 are independent claims.
3. The IDS received 03/24/2003, 04/22/2003, and 02/25/2004 have been accepted.

***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to because Figure 3 is too large leading to a cut-off of the drawing. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the

examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-5 and 11-28 are rejected as they are indefinite and unclear. Claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 14, 17, and 23 claim both an apparatus/computer-readable medium along with a method, and is therefore indefinite. The remainder of the claims are rejected as they are dependent upon the claims above.

Claims 6-10 are rejected as they are indefinite and unclear. Claim 6 is directed toward a network node and a method, and is therefore indefinite. Claims 7-10 are rejected as they are dependent upon claim 6.

As per claims 21 and 26, the phrase "PCF of a P-CSCF" is unclear and indefinite. The Examiner does not understand how a PCF is part of a P-CSCF.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Widegren et al. US Patent Application Publication 2002/0120749 (hereinafter '749).

As per claim 1, '749 teaches media binding in a PDP (packet data protocol) context (paragraph 66). Binding information for one or more media flows of a session is taught in paragraphs 68 and 71. "Media binding information is created for each media data stream. The media binding information associates each media data stream in the session to one of the media packet access bearers and is used to provide session-based control of each of the media packet access bearers" (paragraph 68). Binding information includes an authorization token and one or more IP media flow identifiers: "media binding information for one of the media data streams includes a session identifier that identifies the session and a media data stream identifier corresponding to the one media data stream" (paragraph 68). Paragraph 122 indicates that the session identifier is an authorization token. '749 is directed toward IP media flows and

identifiers, as paragraph 3 indicates so as well as Figure 1. Transmitting this information can be seen in Figure 1.

As per claims 2 and 7, paragraph '71 teaches "In one example, the session identifier is included in session authorization signaling, and the media flow identifier for the corresponding media flow is added to the session identifier to generate the media binding information for that media flow." As already indicated in the rejection for claim 1, paragraph 122 indicates that the session identifier is an authorization token.

As per claims 3 and 8, the use of SIP and using SDP for referencing is taught in paragraph 70. User equipment is taught in paragraph 110 along with a P-CSCF/PCF, which uses SIP protocol.

As per claim 4, paragraph 61 teaches a PDP context activation request and a PDP context modification request.

As per claims 5 and 10, it is inherent that there is a computer readable medium, as the system described in '749 utilizes a computer, and a computer or apparatus that performs such methods will comprise of a computer readable medium.

Independent claim 6 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 1. This happens in a network node, as indicated in paragraph 71.

As per claims 9 and 16, paragraphs 64, 65, and 67 teach policy rules that authorize media flow. Paragraph 67 also teaches that this can use a server-based local policy decision.

As per independent claim 11, the method of requesting resource authorization and allocation is taught in '749. Resources are allocated as media is flowing.

Receiving a media authorization token is taught in paragraph 193. Paragraph 111 and 113 teaches the transmittal of a context activation request. This requests include media binding information. As found in the rejection for claim 1, this media binding information includes an authorization token in combination with a media flow identifier. Paragraph 113 indicates that this information is sufficient to uniquely identify media flows from among plural media flows of the session: "The media binding information is used by the ... to uniquely identify, monitor, and control the IP media flows and bearers from the session level" (paragraph 113). There are a plurality of media flow identifiers as each identifier "uniquely" identifies media flows. As rejected in claim 5 above, it is inherent that this system comprises a computer-readable medium. Transmitting and receiving information can be seen in Figures 1 and 2.

As per claim 12, '749 teaches in paragraph 121 that a media flow identifier reference a flow order in a session description (SDP is a session description). Paragraph 190 teaches a gateway node referred to as a "gate keeper" that authorizes media flows according to policy decisions. Service-based local policy decisions are taught in paragraph 67.

As per claim 13, paragraph 120 teaches a second media authorization token. As is taught in this paragraph, this token is combined with the media stream: "Because both entities use the same procedure, both generate the same media stream identifier for each stream. The complete media binding information is the combination of the session token and the media stream identifier." As is taught in paragraph 67, these requests can be modification requests, in which binding information is attached to.

As per independent claim 14, a computer-readable medium having executable instructions for authorizing and allocating resources is already rejected in claim 11. A network node is rejected using the same arguments used to reject claim 6. Receiving a context request including a media authorization token for authorizing each of one or more media flows of a session, wherein the media authorization token in combination with a media flow identifier from among plural media flow identifiers is sufficient to uniquely identify a media flow from among plural media flows of the session is already rejected in claim 11 as well. Although claim 11 teaches transmitting this information, this information will need to be received in some manner, and paragraphs 111 and 113 teach receiving the information request as well. Paragraph 106 teaches requesting policy information indicated by the media authorization token: "In addition, the media binding information is used to retrieve session, media, and policy-related information from the multimedia system." It is discussed earlier that the media binding information includes the authorization token.

As per claim 15, '749 teaches in paragraph 121 that a media flow identifier reference a flow order in a session description (SDP is a session description).

As per independent claim 17, a computer-readable medium having encoded therein computer-executable instructions for causing user equipment programmed thereby to perform a method of requesting resource authorization and allocation for one or more packet media flows of a session is already rejected in the rejection for claim 11. Receiving an authorization token and packet media flow information is already rejected in the rejection for claim 1 and 11 above, and paragraph 68 indicates that this is



performed during session signaling. Transmitting one or more messages including binding information for authorizing one or more packet media flows of a session, wherein the binding information includes the authorization token, is already rejected in the rejection for claim 1 and 11. Paragraph 120 indicates that one or more packet media flow identifiers is interpreted relative to the authorization token to identify a packet media flow of the session. The media stream described in 120 is a packet media flow, as the transfer of data is done through packets throughout the whole reference. Receiving and transmitting all this information is also shown in Figures 1 and 2.

As per claim 18, paragraphs 28 indicates that the user equipment may be a cellular device. Paragraph 20 teaches a GGSN, and paragraph 61 teaches a PDP context activation request and a PDP context modification request.

As per claim 19, '749 is directed toward IP media flows, as paragraph 3 and Figure 1 indicate the system utilizing Internet Protocol.

As per claim 20, paragraphs 63 and 70 teaches SDP, in which it comprises the packet media flow information. Paragraph 70 states "In other words, the media binding information may be included in the SDP information for the multimedia session." Paragraph 121 indicates the media stream identifier may include the order in the SDP description.

As per claim 21, SIP is taught in paragraph 63. Paragraphs 185 and 186 teach that the authorization token is created by the PCF, and stored in the P-CSCF. This indicates that the PCF is working along with the P-CSCF, and is therefore part of it.

As per claim 22, paragraph 21 indicates that a single message can be used to request resource authorization and allocation for all packet media flows of the session. Paragraph 21 cites "One or more application flows may be established over a single PDP context through negotiations with the GGSN." As can be seen, a single context can initiate media flow, which consists of resource authorization and allocation. Resource authorization and allocation is rejected in claim 11.

Independent claim 23 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 17. Transmitting information and data can be seen in Figures 1 and 2. Also, after information and data is received, it is processed as User B in Figure 1 needs to understand the information. Throughout the whole reference in '749, the interactions between user A and B can be seen, as information and data is being transferred and processed between the two.

Claim 24 is rejected using the same basis of arguments for claim 18 and 19.

Claim 25 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 20.

Claim 26 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 21.

Claim 27 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 22.

As per claim 28, paragraph 106 teaches requesting policy information indicated by the media authorization token: "In addition, the media binding information is used to retrieve session, media, and policy-related information from the multimedia system." It is discussed earlier that the media binding information includes the authorization token.


**Conclusion**

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason K. Gee whose telephone number is (571) 272-6431. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jason Gee  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2134  
02/09 /06

  
GILBERTO BARRON JR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

ECT